THREE SHRUBS IN PALLADIUS:

rorandrum, ulex, tinus

BY

R. H. RODGERS

(Berkeley)

Students of late Latin, as well as Romance linguists, have derived a vast deal of information from the technical treatises of late antiquity. Palladius, an early fifth-century writer on agriculture, was the starting point of a masterful monograph published by Josef Svennung in 1935: *Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache* (Uppsala, 1935). While Palladius derived most of his handbook from earlier sources (more than one-third from Columella alone), his language and vocabulary are often those of his own day. Preparation of a new edition of the *Opus agriculturae* provides an opportunity to discover manuscript support for some of the less commonly used Latin plant names.

Evidence from the text of Palladius merits serious consideration, moreover, even when he borrows from an earlier writer, for the manuscript transmission of Palladius is more reliable than that of Columella. This is largely explained by the widespread popularity of Palladius' treatise from the ninth century onwards, due perhaps to the abbreviated and straightforward nature of his agricultural manual. The following notes aim to supplement the wealth of material gathered by Svennung. They will, I hope, contribute something to Latin lexicography, as well as offer a hint of the textual alterations assured by a fresh investigation of Palladius manuscripts [1].

[1] This paper represents in somewhat altered form a few of the lexicographical remarks which I had hoped to deliver at the XIIe Conférence Internationale du Comité EIRENE held at Cluj in October 1972.

The latest critical edition of Palladius' *Opus agriculturae* is that of J. C. Schmitt (Leipzig, Teubner, 1898). Earlier editions: Aldus (Venice, 1513); J. M. Gesner (Leipzig, 1735; 2nd ed. by A. Ernesti, 1773); J. G. Schneider (Leipzig, 1795). All but Schmitt's are editions of the *Scriptores rei rusticae*.

I have deliberately avoided the minutiae of MS variants. Readings are based on my own collations of all MSS prior to the twelfth century as well as a few significant later codices. There are no important variants for the three words I discuss in this paper.

St Cl, XV., 1973, p. 153 – 155, Bucureşti.

I,19.3 aliqui *rorandri* folia frumentis miscent ad seruandum profutura.

The vulgate *coriandri* cannot stand against the consensus of reliable MSS. In the first place, *rorandri* is unlikely to have been a corruption of *coriandri*, for Palladius seems to have written *coliandrum* [2]. Schneider and Schmitt knew the variant *rorandri*, but both dismissed it as insignificant. There is, however, good attestation for *rorandrum* (= ῥοδοδάφνη, *Nerium oleander* Linn.) as one of several Latin names for the rose-laurel. Glosses of ῥοδοδάφνη include *rorandrum* (*CGL* III, 428.28) as well as *rudrandrum* (III, 191.67) and *rodandrum* (III, 264.45). And in Dioscorides we find (IV, 81) Ῥωμαῖοι ῥοράνδρουμ (sc. καλοῦσιν); cf. Isid., *Etym.*, XVII, 7.54 'Rhododendron, quod corrupte uulgo lorandrum uocatur' [3].

Uses of *rhododaphne* or *rhododendron* are mentioned by Pliny, *H.N.*, XVI, 79 and XXIV,90; cf. Isid., *loc. cit.*: 'interficit enim animalia, et medetur serpentium uexationes'. (Agricultural uses are also noted in Luc., *Asin.*, 17 and Artem., I, 77.) Palladius does not use the word *rorandrum* elsewhere: at I, 35.9 he prescribes *rododafnes folia* against field-mice, but the passage is probably copied directly from his Greek source (cf. Geop., XIII, 5.3). The sentence with *rorandrum* is most likely Palladius' own addition; the balance of the chapter is based on Col., I, 6.10ff., save for the reference to *Graeci* at the end. Context makes it clear that *ad seruandum* means against attacks by vermin. Our ancient sources do not elsewhere list laurel or bay-leaves among the deterrents to vermin which attacked grain in storage [4], but the plant's properties could easily have suggested this and the poisonous leaves could have been removed when the grain was sifted before grinding [5].

I, 37.2 *ulex* minor et *tinus*

Palladius is speaking of the proper location for beehives: 'sit abundans floribus, quos uel in herbis, uel in fruticibus uel in arboribus procuret industria'. The entire chapter is derived from Col., IX, 4—5.

ulex, 'gorse', is certainly the correct reading, both here and at Col., IX,4.2 (where it is the original lection of both *S* and *A*). The word was not a familiar one (the only other citation is Pliny, *H.N.*, XXXIII,

---

[2] The single exception for Books I—XIII is IV, 9.15 where all MSS read *coriandrum*. Note also that in Book XIV, where only later MSS are available (two from s. XIII and one from s. XVI) and the orthography is less reliable, *coliandrum* appears in one MS at XIV, 25.5. For forms, see *Thes. L.L.* IV, 950.71ff.; Svennung, *Untersuchungen*, 131f.; cf. E. Schopf, *Die konsonantischen Fernwirkungen: Fern-Dissimilation, Fern-Assimilation und Metathesis*, Forschungen zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik 5 (Göttingen, 1919), 86.

[3] M. Niedermann, *Contributions à la critique et à l'explication des gloses latines*, Recueil des travaux publiés par la Faculté des lettres, Académie de Neuchâtel 1 (Neuchâtel, 1905), 41—42; Schopf, 100. See also J. André, *Lexique des termes de botanique en latin*, Études et commentaires 23 (Paris, 1956), 274.

[4] Pliny, *H. N.*, XVIII, 301ff. names various remedies against the two dangers to grain in storage: dampness and vermin. Cf. K. D. White, *Roman Farming* (London, 1970), 189.

[5] Mr. Patrick Diehl pointed out an interesting modern parallel: for several generations the cooks of his family have stored bay-leaves with flour to repel weevils. The subject came up when we were eating a loaf of bread with a bay-leaf inadvertently left in the flour. (Patrik apologized profusely, but the bread was good.)

76) [6], and it was easily supplanted by the commoner *ilex*, known for example from Virgil, *Ecl.*, VII, 1, Horace, *Carm.*, III, 13.14, Ovid, *Met.*, I, 112, etc. It is on the whole unlikely that a rare word would replace a common word independently in the MS traditions of both Columella and Palladius. *Ilex minor* would presumably be holly (*Ilex aquifolium* Linn. ; Pliny, *H.N.*, XVI, 19), of questionable interest to bees. Columella identifies two varieties of *ulex*: the *minor* recommended, and *prolixior* 'ab omnibus inprobatur'.

tinus, 'laurus tinus' (*Viburnum tinus* Linn.), should definitely be printed. This plant too was an unfamiliar one, and the word was easily confused with the well-known *pinus*. MSS of Palladius have almost unanimously preserved *tinus*, though the word has been lost in the transmission of Columella : IX, 4.2 semper uirens tinus (pinus *codd.*), and IX,5.6 casiae atque tini (pini *codd.*). As long ago as 1689 Salmasius emended the text of Columella [7], but editors have paid him little heed, and the evidence from Palladius was not available [8]. Pontedera in the eighteenth century maintained that *pinus* (which he derived from Columella) was the correct reading for Palladius. Bees, he said, used pine resin for making wax [9]: he ought to have noticed that both Columella and Palladius clearly imply that they are listing plants useful for making honey.

It might be useful to summarize the MS evidence for *tinus* in classical authors. Virgil, *Georg.*, IV, 112 thymum tinosque ferens (tinosque M^1P : pinosque $M^2F\omega$), *Georg.*, IV, 141 uberrima tinus (tinus M^1 : pinus $M^2P\omega$)[10]; *Culex*, 407 semper florida tinus (tinus *Salmasius* : pinus *codd.*); Ovid, *Met.*, X, 98 bacis caerula tinus (tinus *Heinsius* : pinus/ficus/cinus *codd.*); Pliny, *H.N.*, XV, 128 tinus (*codd.*), *H.N.*, XVII, 60 tinus (tinus *Gelenus* : pinus *codd.*). In all these cases *tinus* is the correct reading. Misunderstanding and misprints have had their day, and *tinus* will certainly return to the new edition of Palladius.

---

[6] Save for Otto Morgenstern's emendation (*ulicis* for a corrupt *ulci*) in *Mulomedicina Chironis*, 873 (I owe this reference to Dr. W. Ehlers of the *Thes. L. L.*); cf. André, *Lexique*, 334.

[7] Claudii Salmasii *Plinianae exercitationes in Caji Julii Solini Polyhistora* (Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1689), vol. I, p. 198.

[8] *tinus* appeared in the *editio princeps* (Venice, 1472) and in Schmitt's edition of Book I (Würzburg, 1876). Otherwise editors have printed some strange things : *cinus*, poorly attested and of uncertain meaning (glossed in Aldine ed. 'arboris species' ; cf. *CGL* V, 565.46 'cinus genus herbe' ; *Thes. L.L.* III, 1077.53 marks the word as questionable) ; Gesner printed *linus*, presumably a variant of *linum* 'flax' (Schmitt's *linus* is probably a misprint) ; Schneider preferred to follow Pontedera's *pinus*.

[9] Quoted in Gesner's 2nd edition *ad loc.*

[10] Cf. Vatican scholia to Virgil, *Georg.*, IV, 112 : 'laurus siluestris, caerulea baca', probably based on Pliny, *H.N.*, XV, 128.